



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BOOK REVIEWS

Moral Training in the Public Schools. Five Essays by CHARLES RUGH, T. P. STEVENSON, EDWIN D. STARBUCK, FRANK CRAMER, GEORGE E. MEYERS. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1907. 12mo, cloth, pp. 208.

Educational science is confronted with no more difficult or more important problem than that of moral training in the public schools. The reason why so much that is irrelevant and impractical has been said upon the subject is, that science has not settled in any definite and authoritative way what the determining forces of conduct are nor to what extent and by what means these forces can be generated or controlled by the conscious processes of education. The results of experience and experiment are no less vague and unsatisfactory than the pronouncements of science. The educational practitioner may therefore be excused if he is more or less at sea.

"If to do were as easy as to know what were good to do," our course would be plain. It is easy to teach creeds and catechisms; it is easy to teach the ten commandments and all the prohibitions and injunctions of the sternest moral code. But though "the brain may devise laws for the blood, yet a hot temper leaps o'er a cold decree." We may envy the simple faith of those who believe that he who knows what is right and *our* reasons for thinking it right will practice the right, but when we interrogate science and human experience for a justification of that faith we are disappointed. Since there is no exact method of determining the moral efficiency of the public schools, that efficiency is naturally underrated by those who are appalled by what they conceive to be the increasing if not unparalleled immorality of their day and generation. On the other hand, those who have faith in the character forming power of dogmatic instruction on morals are quick to devise a system of instruction which they think will be a panacea for all our social, political, and industrial ailments. Since there have long been schools in which formal instruction in religion and morals has had a regular place on the daily programme, and since in every city of the United States there are today schools in which the same formal teaching occurs, it seems that an examination of the results of such schools might be made in accordance with scientific methods. If the pupils of these schools are found to be more manly and womanly than the pupils of the public schools, more chaste in speech and thought, more respectful to their parents, more fervent in business, stronger to resist temptation, more faithful to their employers, more strictly law abiding, the case for dogmatic instruction in religion and morals would be at least half won. In the absence of such results established by thorough investigation, skepticism in regard to the efficacy of following the young about with "a movable pulpit" has grown apace. And yet we may be nearer salvation than when we believed. This skepticism forces the students of educational science to a profounder study of these questions: Whence cometh character? What are the limitations of the school's responsibilities? By what means can they perform their whole duty in the training of "exemplary citizens?"

The conditions under which the public schools work may well allay the

ecstasy of our enthusiasm in regard to the magnitude and speed of results to be achieved by any system of moral training. That the public schools reach no children until the home and the street have wrought upon their inherited instincts for five years, that it loses one-half of them by the time they are twelve years old, and three-fourths of them by the time they are fourteen years old, that it has them not to exceed five hours out of the twenty-four, and only for five days in the week, and that they bring into the school the spirit of their outside environment, should temper our enthusiasm with sober caution.

Such are the reflections evoked by the little book under discussion. The controversial spirit is encouragingly absent from it: "Two things," says the author of the fourth essay, "have been permanently settled by the American people; the children of the nation shall be educated in the public schools, and religious instruction shall not be given in those schools." For the most part the authors of these essays accept as a postulate, that "adjustment to persons is the heart of morality," and as far as they seek sanctions for the moral code they find them in the inexorable necessity of our social organization.

The reading of these essays seems to force upon us these conclusions: (1) That the personality of the teacher is the controlling factor in any solution of the problem they discuss; (2) That antecedent to any considerable improvement in results we must have a greater proportion of more mature and professionally trained teachers; (3) That in this professional training must be included a broad discussion of the subject of moral training in the public schools; (4) That textbooks for teachers, not for pupils, must be provided in order that there may be available, suitable and systematically arranged material; (5) That our work must be as systematic in this subject as in others, though at any cost it must be divested of that formal, spiritless, wooden character, which in the opinion of competent judges has often rendered moral instruction futile if not harmful; (6) That when all is said success depends in this, as in other subjects, upon the intelligence, tact, earnestness, and personal character of the teacher.

The essays, especially the first, abound in definite practical suggestions. Among the most valuable of these suggestions are those on pp. 39 to 49, which treat of "Punishment, and the Reformation of the Wrongdoer." On the whole, sound, sane, suggestive, instructive, inspiring, seem to the reviewer the adjectives that most fitly describe this little book. It is worthy the attention of teachers.

CHESTER T. LANE

FORT WAYNE HIGH SCHOOL

The Later Cave-Men. By KATHARINE E. DOPP. Chicago: Rand, McNally & Co.

This book is the third in a series whose full significance it is hard to estimate. *The Tree-Dwellers* and *The Early Cave-Men* were pioneer works—new educational tools in fact, and in our devotion to books made in the form of those we have been long accustomed to, it is not strange that every teacher does not know how to use this new resource at once. On the other hand to many who realize that schooling is primarily a matter of doing and thinking rather than of mechanical adjustment, this organization of material has proved to be of real service.